

REMARKS

The specification is amended to correct grammatical and other mistakes without adding new matter. The two changes as noted cannot be rewritten as new paragraphs easily because they are for single sentences in between aggregations of formulas. Accordingly, the applicant requests that the changes be made to two specific pinpoint cites. In particular the applicant requests that the two instances on lines 5 and 16 on page 21 of “lowpass” be rewritten as –low pass–.

Claims 2, 8, 10 and 21 are amended to correct claim dependencies resulting from claim cancellations. Claim 5 is amended for a minor punctuation problem.

Claims 1-3, 8, 13-19 were rejected. Claims 4-7, 9-12 and 20-22 were objected to. The applicant appreciates the indication of allowability for these claims.

More specifically, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Haung et al. (US 6,771,709).

With respect to claim 1, the limitation of claims 2 and 4 are incorporated into claim 1. The applicant believes that such amendment to claim 1 overcomes the cited art and renders claim 1 and its dependent claims allowable.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Glas (US 6,330,290). Claim 17 was amended to include limitations from claim 18 as well as limitations similar to those of claims 2 and 4 to render claim 17 allowable.

Claims 2, 3, 8 and 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haung et al. (US 6,771,709) in view of Glas (US 6,330,290).

As each of these claims depend from claim 1, it is believed that the rejection to these claims are overcome.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glas (US 6,330,290). As claim 18 is cancelled and at least some of its limitations are incorporated into claim 17 as previously described, it is believed that the combination of the limitations of claim 18 as incorporated into claim 17 along with the other amendments to claim 17 described above render the rejection to the limitations of claim 18 moot.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glas (US 6,330,290) in view of Demir et al. (US 2004/0264598). As claim 19 was amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 20, and claim 20 was indicated as being allowable, it is believed that claims 19, 21-22 are now allowable.

As each of the independent claims is amended, it is believed that the grounds of rejection are either overcome or moot. Accordingly, the applicant requests reconsideration of the claims as presently constituted and allowance of the case.

Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, the Applicant asserts that the remaining Claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests an early allowance of such Claims.

If any issues arise, or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this Application, the Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Garlick Harrison & Markison Deposit Account No. 50-2126 (ref. BP 3353).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 15, 2007

/James A. Harrison/Reg. No. 40,401
James A. Harrison

Garlick Harrison & Markison
P.O. Box 160727
Austin, TX 78716-0727
Telephone: (214) 902-8100
Facsimile: (214) 902-8101